



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/650,451	08/27/2003	Subhas C. Bose Jayappa Veeramma	011775-013210US	7137
20350 7590 03/06/2008 TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER EIGHTH FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834				
EXAMINER				
NADAV, ORI				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2811				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/06/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary**Application No.**

10/650,451

Applicant(s)

BOSE JAYAPPA VEERAMMA ET AL.

Examiner

Ori Nadav

Art Unit

2811

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 December 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 4-25 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 26-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3 and 25-26, 28 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yano (5,138,415) in view of Gross (5,316,964).

Yano teaches in figure 2 and related text a power device, comprising:

a semiconductor substrate 16 of first conductivity having an upper surface and a lower surface;

a first electrode terminal 29 coupled to a first conductive region 24 provided proximate the upper surface of the substrate, the first electrode terminal being provided over the upper surface of the substrate;

a second electrode terminal 36 coupled to a second conductive region 18 provided proximate the lower surface of the substrate, the second electrode terminal being provided below the lower surface of the substrate;

an isolation diffusion region 17 of second conductivity P provided at a periphery of the substrate and extending from the upper surface to the lower surface of the substrate, the isolation diffusion region having a first surface corresponding to the upper surface of the substrate and a second surface corresponding to the lower surface; and

a passivation layer 28 provided over the upper surface of the substrate, the first surface of the isolation diffusion region;

wherein the first and second electrode terminals define a vertical electrical current path there between, and

wherein the peripheral junction region is provided to compensate the surface depletion of the isolation diffusion region.

Yano does not teach a peripheral junction region of second conductivity formed at least partly within the isolation diffusion region and formed proximate the first surface of the isolation diffusion region, wherein the peripheral junction region is different than the first and second conductive regions.

Gross teaches in figure 2 and related text a peripheral junction region of second conductivity N⁺ formed at least partly within an N type isolation diffusion region 16, 17 and formed proximate the first surface of the isolation diffusion region.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to form a peripheral junction region of second conductivity at least partly within the isolation diffusion region and formed proximate the first surface of the isolation diffusion region, in Yano's device in order to increase the electrical isolation capabilities of the device. The combination is motivated by the teachings of Gross who points out the advantages of using a peripheral junction region within the isolation junction region (column 2, lines 38-41).

Note that prior art's device includes a peripheral junction region being different than the first and second conductive regions.

Regarding claims 26, 28 and 30, prior art's device includes a passivation layer includes an oxide layer and contacts the upper surface of the substrate, the first surface of the isolation diffusion region, and the peripheral junction region,

wherein the peripheral junction region is provided to compensate the surface depletion of dopants in the isolation diffusion region and increase a reverse blocking voltage of the device by reducing an electric field at the first surface of the isolation diffusion region, and

wherein the device is a diode and the first electrode terminal being separated from the isolation diffusion region.

Claims 27 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yano and Gross, as applied to claims 1 and 26 above, and further in view of Collins (5,262,754).

Yano and Gross teach substantially the entire claimed structure, as applied to claims 1 and 26 above, except a passivation layer includes a polyimide layer over the oxide layer. Collins teaches using a polyimide layer when packaging the device (column 2, lines 50-55).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a polyimide layer when packaging the device, such that the passivation layer includes a polyimide layer over the oxide layer, in prior art's device in order to provide better protection for the device.

Response to Arguments

Applicant argues that Gross does not teach a peripheral junction region of second conductivity formed at least partly within an N type isolation diffusion region, because Gross forms resistors in the isolation regions, and the peripheral junction region of claim 1 is not a resistor.

The examiner does not cite the resistors of Gross as being the peripheral junction region. Gross explicitly state in column 1, lines 38-41 that "In the parts of the isolation region 24 where no resistors are needed, a heavily doped N type diffusion region is formed to increase the isolation". Therefore, Gross teaches in figure 2 and related text a peripheral junction region of second conductivity N+ formed at least partly within an N type isolation diffusion region 16, 17, as claimed.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ori Nadav whose telephone number is 571-272-1660. The examiner can normally be reached between the hours of 7 AM to 4 PM (Eastern Standard Time) Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lynne Gurley can be reached on 571-272-1670. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).